Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Utica, seem to have helped him not only to establish standards at his own institution but also to characterize it more effectively. By now that distinctive character which Clark later asserts asylums generally acquire, that strangely hypertrophic yet stunted personality first indicated in Workman's reports, has coalesced and hardened.

While in its administrative arrangements the Asylum is the equal of any of its "energetic and intelligent neighbours" (210), and in its external physical arrangements it is superior, the qualification is important; internally it is inferior in its cooking ranges, its laundries, its ventilation, and even in its "bedsteads, bureaus, carpets, sofas, pictures, statuary, apparatus for amusements, gymnasia, &c." (210). Characteristically avoiding the wholesale and heroic-sounding denunciations of state parsimony of Workman's reports, Clark concludes "much remains to be done" by the Ontario government to bring its spending to par with that of states no wealthier. Obviously most of Clark's energies, and certainly those of the staff and the clients who do most of the hard labour, are directed at redressing these internal deficiencies.

Despite their best efforts, by 1891 the negative pole in Clark's discussion of different asylum plans is represented by his own "Asylum for the Insane, Toronto." In the report for 1891 a section on "Detached Buildings for the Insane" is preceded by a section on "Deaths," as if to suggest that the design and organization of asylums is no less than a matter of life and death and that the design of his own Asylum might now be almost as lethal as the diseases it was intended to cure. Small detached buildings facilitate,

> better ventilation, the isolation from one another, the access to more sunlight and fresh air, the better classification, the greater facilities to get out of doors, the removal of the noisy, filthy and epileptic from the quiet and decent. (1891, 6)

They resemble the cottages in the grounds of the Toronto Asylum, but not the Asylum itself, by implication one of the "monuments of architectural folly" that he castigates. He quotes from the Annual Report of the State Board of Charities of New York on the opposition of that body to state expenditure on enormous buildings, not for accommodation but "concentration of the